

Adam E. Polk (SBN 273000)
Simon Grille (SBN 294914)
Nina R. Gliozzo (SBN 333569)
GIRARD SHARP LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 981-4800
Facsimile: (415) 981-4846
apolk@girardsharp.com
sgrille@girardsharp.com
ngliozzo@girardsharp.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TYRONE HAZEL, ROXANE EVANS,
VALERIE TORRES, and RHONDA HYMAN,
individually and on behalf of all others similarly
situated.

Plaintiffs,

V.

PRUDENTIAL FINANCIAL, INC. and
ACTIVEPROSPECT, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:22-cv-07465-CRB

**PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION
TO DISMISS THE FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT**

Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer
Date: June 9, 2023
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Courtroom: 6 – 17th Floor

1 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

2	I.	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
3	II.	STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
4	III.	ARGUMENT.....	3
5	A.	Plaintiffs Sufficiently Plead a Section 631 Claim.	3
6	1.	Plaintiffs' Communications Were Sent From California and Intercepted While	
7		"In Transit."	4
8	2.	ActiveProspect Is an Unauthorized Third Party.	8
9	B.	Plaintiffs Adequately Allege Invasion of Privacy.	11
10	C.	Plaintiffs' UCL Claims Should Be Sustained.....	13
11	IV.	CONCLUSION.....	14
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Adler v. Community.com, Inc.,</i> 2021 WL 4805435 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 2, 2021).....	6
<i>Alhadeff v. Experian Info. Sols., Inc.,</i> 541 F. Supp. 3d 1041 (C.D. Cal. 2021)	5
<i>Baird v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.,</i> 522 F. Supp. 3d 679 (N.D. Cal. 2021)	7
<i>Baron v. Hyrecar Inc.,</i> 2022 WL 17413562 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2022).....	7
<i>Brahmana v. Lembo,</i> 2009 WL 1424438 (N.D. Cal. May 20, 2009).....	5
<i>Brown v. Google LLC,</i> 525 F. Supp. 3d 1049 (N.D. Cal. 2021).....	12
<i>Bruton v. Gerber Prod. Co.,</i> 703 F. App'x 468 (9th Cir. 2017)	13
<i>Bushy v. Green,</i> 2022 WL 2442739 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2022)	8
<i>Byars v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.,</i> 2023 WL 1788553 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 3, 2023)	5
<i>Byrd v. Aaron's, Inc.,</i> 2012 WL 12887775 (W.D. Pa. Feb. 17, 2012).....	5
<i>Calhoun v. Google LLC,</i> 526 F. Supp. 3d 605 (N.D. Cal. 2021).....	11, 13, 14
<i>Campbell v. Facebook Inc.,</i> 77 F. Supp. 3d 836 (N.D. Cal. 2014)	5
<i>Cline v. Reetz-Laiolo,</i> 329 F. Supp. 3d 1000 (N.D. Cal. 2018)	11
<i>Eastman v. Apple, Inc.,</i> 2019 WL 3934805 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 20, 2019)	8
<i>Five Star Gourmet Foods, Inc. v. Fresh Express, Inc.,</i> 2020 WL 1250802 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 16, 2020).....	8
<i>Folgstrom v. Lamps Plus, Inc.,</i> 195 Cal. App. 4th 986 (2011)	12
<i>Garcia v. Haskett,</i> 2006 WL 1821232 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2006).....	7
<i>Gianino v. Alacer Corp.,</i> 2010 WL 11468710 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 4, 2010).....	14

1	<i>Hammerling v. Google LLC</i> , 2022 WL 17365255 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 1, 2022).....	12
2	<i>In re Adobe Sys., Inc. Privacy Litig.</i> , 66 F. Supp. 3d 1197 (N.D. Cal. 2014).....	14
3	<i>In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.</i> , 162 F. Supp. 3d 953 (N.D. Cal. 2016).....	14
4	<i>In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.</i> , 2016 WL 3029783 (N.D. Cal. May 27, 2016).....	13
5	<i>In re Carrier IQ, Inc.</i> , 78 F. Supp. 3d 1051 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....	6
6	<i>In re Facebook, Inc. Internet Tracking Litig.</i> , 956 F.3d 589 (9th Cir. 2020)	11, 12, 13
7	<i>In re Google RTB Consumer Privacy Litig.</i> , 606 F. Supp. 3d 935 (N.D. Cal. 2022).....	11
8	<i>In re Google, Inc. Privacy Policy Litig.</i> , 58 F. Supp. 3d 968 (N.D. Cal. 2014).....	13
9	<i>In re iPhone Application Litig.</i> , 844 F. Supp. 2d 1040 (N.D. Cal. 2012)	12
10	<i>In re Meta Pixel Healthcare Litig.</i> , 2022 WL 17869218 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2022).....	11, 12
11	<i>In re Vizio, Inc., Consumer Privacy Litig.</i> , 238 F. Supp. 3d 1204 (C.D. Cal. 2017)	6
12	<i>In re Yahoo Mail Litig.</i> , 7 F. Supp. 3d 1016 (N.D. Cal. 2014)	5
13	<i>Javier v. Assurance IQ, LLC</i> (“ <i>Javier I</i> ”), 2022 WL 1744107 (9th Cir. May 31, 2022).....	3, 5, 10
14	<i>Javier v. Assurance IQ, LLC</i> (“ <i>Javier II</i> ”), — F. Supp. 3d —, 2023 WL 114225 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2023)	9, 10
15	<i>Katz-Lacabe v. Oracle America, Inc.</i> , 2023 WL 2838118 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2023).....	11
16	<i>Khoja v. Orexigen Therapeutics, Inc.</i> , 899 F.3d 988 (9th Cir. 2018)	7
17	<i>Konop v. Hawaiian Airlines, Inc.</i> , 302 F.3d 868 (9th Cir. 2002)	6
18	<i>Luis v. Zang</i> , 833 F.3d 619 (6th Cir. 2016)	5, 6
19	<i>Matera v. Google Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 5339806 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2016)	9
20	<i>McKell v. Wash. Mut., Inc.</i> , 142 Cal. App. 4th 1457 (2006)	14

1	<i>NovelPoster v. Javitch Canfield Grp.</i> , 140 F. Supp. 3d 938 (N.D. Cal. 2014)	7
2	<i>Overstock.com v. Gradient Analytics, Inc.</i> , 151 Cal. App. 4th 688 (2007)	13
3	<i>Pallen v. Twin Hill Acquisition Co.</i> , 2013 WL 12130033 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2013)	14
4	<i>Pollock v. Fed. Ins. Co.</i> , 2022 WL 912893 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2022)	8
5	<i>Produce Pay, Inc. v. Izguerra Produce, Inc.</i> , 39 F.4th 1158 (9th Cir. 2022)	8
6	<i>Revitch v. New Moosejaw, LLC</i> , 2019 WL 5485330 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2019)	4, 9
7	<i>Ribas v. Clark</i> , 38 Cal. 3d 355 (1985)	4
8	<i>Rogers v. Ulrich</i> , 52 Cal. App. 3d 894 (1975)	10
9	<i>Royal 4 Sys., Inc. v. RLI Ins. Co.</i> , 2022 WL 19263327 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 9, 2022)	8
10	<i>Saleh v. Nike, Inc.</i> , 562 F. Supp. 3d 503 (C.D. Cal. 2021)	4, 10
11	<i>Starr v. Baca</i> , 652 F.3d 1202 (9th Cir. 2011)	5, 8
12	<i>Tripharma, LLC v. First Fruits Bus. Ministry LLC</i> , 2023 WL 2695476 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 15, 2023)	7
13	<i>Williams v. What If Holdings, LLC</i> , 2022 WL 17869275 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2022)	9, 10
14	<i>Yoon v. Lululemon USA, Inc.</i> , 549 F. Supp. 3d 1073 (C.D. Cal. 2021)	10
15	<i>Yunker v. Pandora Media, Inc.</i> , 2013 WL 1282980 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2013)	12
16	<i>Zeller v. Optavia, LLC</i> , 2022 WL 17858032 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2022)	7
17	Statutes	
18	Cal. Penal Code § 631	1, 9
19	Cal. Penal Code § 631(a)	3
20	Rules	
21	Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)	7
22	Fed. R. Civ. P. 15	14

1 **I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

2 Plaintiffs Roxane Evans, Valerie Torres, Rhonda Hyman, and Tyrone Hazel visited Prudential's
 3 website to obtain life insurance quotes. They answered sensitive, personal questions about their health,
 4 divulging their age, height and weight, medical and psychological conditions, prescriptions, and history
 5 of hospitalization. Plaintiffs did not know that Prudential was using ActiveProspect's "TrustedForm"
 6 software to intercept and record their keystrokes and interactions with Prudential's website, including all
 7 the sensitive information they typed when answering the queries on the form. Prudential gave
 8 ActiveProspect access to these communications, permitting ActiveProspect to look over people's
 9 shoulders without first notifying them or obtaining their consent. ActiveProspect's interceptions using
 10 TrustedForm, a form of wiretapping, violates the California Invasion of Privacy Act, Cal. Penal Code
 11 § 631 ("CIPA"). Prudential is also liable under CIPA, for enabling this violation.

12 The Court should deny the Defendants' motion to dismiss. Their attempts to distinguish a similar
 13 wiretap case against ActiveProspect that involves the same technology, *Javier v. Assurance IQ, LLC*,
 14 No. 3:20-cv-02860-CRB, demonstrate only that this Court's wiretap rulings are well founded. The Court
 15 rejected the substantive challenges to the *Javier* plaintiff's section 631 claim, arguments which are
 16 repeated again here, granting dismissal only on timeliness grounds. In this case, Plaintiffs' amended
 17 complaint (filed February 21st) satisfies the Court's reasoning in its January 5th *Javier* Order unrelated to
 18 the statute of limitations. Defendants admit raising various arguments solely to preserve them and ask
 19 the Court to invert the pleading standard, denying they intercepted Plaintiffs' communications "in
 20 transit" and demanding factual inferences in their favor. These denials are also at odds with
 21 ActiveProspect's own software patent and website, which disclose that the technology intercepts the
 22 data the moment a user enters it. Defendants' competing factual explanations of how this software
 23 functions are not suitable for resolution at this stage.

24 In addition to their wiretap claims Plaintiffs bring two claims that were not at issue in the second
 25 *Javier* motion to dismiss: invasion of privacy under California's Constitution and violations of the
 26 Unfair Competition Law. Defendants contend there was no constitutional privacy violation because the
 27 challenged conduct is not highly offensive to a reasonable person, implying that surreptitiously
 28 capturing consumers' medical facts is just routine commercial conduct. These questions require

1 evidence to resolve and courts have held that intercepting a person's private facts without their
 2 knowledge or prior consent may be sufficiently egregious to qualify as a constitutional invasion of
 3 privacy. Regarding the UCL, many courts have recognized that lost money or property may consist of
 4 the reduced economic value of personal facts that results from their exposure. Defendants themselves
 5 exploit the tangible value of Plaintiffs' data, abridging Plaintiffs' property right in controlling their own
 6 private information. Hence, its collection and disclosure without their consent gives them standing.

7 For the reasons discussed further below, the motion should be denied.

8 **II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

9 Prudential offers life insurance quotes to consumers on its website, Prudential.com. ¶¶ 1, 38.¹ To
 10 obtain a life insurance quote from Prudential's website, consumers must fill out a form that requires
 11 them to list their personal information and answer a series of detailed questions about their health,
 12 including their age, height, weight, prescribed medications, medical conditions such as diabetes, cancer,
 13 or heart problems as well as any psychological diagnoses and treatment history. ¶¶ 38-39. Only after
 14 answering these questions can a consumer view Prudential's insurance quote. ¶ 44.

15 ActiveProspect sells software that allows companies to generate leads for their products and
 16 services. ¶ 22. Prudential uses software made by ActiveProspect called "TrustedForm." ¶¶ 2-3, 24.
 17 According to ActiveProspect's website, TrustedForm contains a "VideoReplay" feature that records a
 18 website visitor's keystrokes, mouse clicks, and other website interactions as they occur. ¶ 25. Once its
 19 script is added to a webpage, TrustedForm automatically begins capturing data the moment a user
 20 accesses the webpage, recording their entry of information, clicks, and other activities on the website. ¶¶
 21 27-32. The user information ActiveProspect captures is then hosted on its own servers, and it shares that
 22 data with clients like Prudential. ¶ 28.

23 Since at least March 2022, Prudential has used TrustedForm on its website and this software is
 24 embedded into the source code of Prudential's website. ¶¶ 41-42. As a result, ActiveProspect is able to
 25 monitor, intercept, and record a consumer's activity on the site and their responses to personal questions,
 26 such as whether they have type 2 diabetes or if they have been treated for depression or bipolar disorder.
 27 ¶ 43. Not until the user answered multiple personal questions, at which point they were prompted to
 28

¹ "¶" references are to the First Amended Class Action Complaint, dkt. 18.

1 consent to its Terms of Use, did Prudential disclose that their responses were being recorded and
 2 intercepted by a third party. ¶ 45. Consumers must affirmatively click to pull up Prudential's privacy
 3 notice just to learn that Prudential may share their information with other companies. ¶¶ 46-47. Hence
 4 by the time consumers are presented with Prudential's legal documents, their communications already
 5 have been intercepted by ActiveProspect without their knowledge and regardless of whether they
 6 consent. ¶¶ 48, 76. In early January 2023, after the filing of this class action and around the time the
 7 Court issued its second motion to dismiss order in *Javier*, Prudential modified its website to add an
 8 inconspicuous, fine-print disclosure that purports to obtain consumer consent to record their inputs. ¶¶
 9 50-52. The new disclaimer evidences Prudential's awareness that it has been intercepting and recording
 10 users' communications without their knowledge or prior consent. *Id.*

11 Plaintiffs are California residents in the market for life insurance who visited Prudential's
 12 website and, responding to the personal questions asked of them, typed in their personal information to
 13 obtain a quote. ¶¶ 57-73. No Plaintiff was aware during their visits that Prudential and ActiveProspect
 14 were recording their electronic communications in real time. No Plaintiff consented to sharing their
 15 private information with ActiveProspect or any other third party. ¶¶ 59-60, 63-64, 67-78, 71-72.

16 Plaintiffs' personal information and web-browsing activities have value. ¶¶ 55-56. Prudential
 17 sells "leads" containing information intercepted by ActiveProspect, and it uses TrustedForm to increase
 18 the value of these leads. ¶¶ 37, 55-56.

19 **III. ARGUMENT**

20 **A. Plaintiffs Sufficiently Plead a Section 631 Claim.**

21 "Though written in terms of wiretapping, Section 631(a) applies to Internet communications."
 22 *Javier v. Assurance IQ, LLC* ("*Javier I*"), 2022 WL 1744107, at *1 (9th Cir. May 31, 2022)
 23 (unpublished disposition). That provision "makes liable anyone who 'reads, or attempts to read, or to
 24 learn the contents' of a communication 'without the consent of all parties to the communication.'" *Id.*
 25 (quoting Cal. Penal Code § 631(a)). The California Supreme Court "also emphasized that all CIPA
 26 provisions are to be interpreted in light of the broad privacy-protecting statutory purposes of CIPA." *Id.*
 27 at *2.

1 Plaintiffs allege that ActiveProspect, as a third party that eavesdropped on their communications,
 2 is liable for violating section 631(a) (¶ 96) and that Prudential is liable because it substantially aided
 3 ActiveProspect's illegal eavesdropping by coding TrustedForm onto Prudential's site (¶ 95). *See Revitch*
 4 *v. New Moosejaw, LLC*, 2019 WL 5485330, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2019) (preserving similar claims);
 5 *Saleh v. Nike, Inc.*, 562 F. Supp. 3d 503, 521 (C.D. Cal. 2021) (same). Defendants dispute their liability
 6 on the grounds that (1) Plaintiffs do not sufficiently allege that their communications were intercepted
 7 "in transit" and (2) ActiveProspect is not an unauthorized third party but rather an extension of
 8 Prudential. These arguments should be rejected for the reasons explained below.

9 **1. Plaintiffs' Communications Were Sent From California and Intercepted
 10 While "In Transit."**

11 Section 631(a) of the California Penal Code provides in pertinent part that a party lacking
 12 consent cannot "read, or attempt to read, or to learn the contents or meaning of any message, report, or
 13 communication while the same is in transit or passing over any wire, line, or cable, or is being sent from,
 14 or received at any place within this state[.]" Thus, the "plain language of section 631" makes a
 15 defendant liable for eavesdropping "communication while the same is *in transit . . . , or is being sent*
 16 *from, or received* at any place within this state[.]" *Ribas v. Clark*, 38 Cal. 3d 355, 360 (1985) (emphasis
 17 in original).

18 As an initial matter, Defendants' singular focus on the "in transit" requirement disregards the
 19 plain text of section 631. The defendant in *Ribas* was liable for eavesdropping on the plaintiff's
 20 conversation "either" while the information was "in transit" or when the communication was "being sent
 21 from" and received at a place in California. *Id.* As Judge Chhabria noted, "Section 631's protections
 22 extend explicitly to the beginnings and ends of communications, so there is no reason to consider the
 23 first part of an electronic communication beyond the statute's reach." *Revitch*, 2019 WL 5485330, at *6.
 24 The California Plaintiffs in this case allege that Defendants intercepted their communications not only
 25 "in transit" but the moment these communications were sent from California. ¶¶ 95-96. By focusing
 26 solely on the "in transit" aspect of section 631, Defendants ignore that Plaintiffs need not show that their
 27 communications were captured while "in transit" to prevail under section 631. Instead, Plaintiffs' claim
 28 stands independently on the fact that their communications at issue were sent from California, where
 they were typing and clicking.

1 Defendants' challenges to the "in transit" allegations are meritless. They make technical
 2 arguments about how TrustedForm functions (Mot. at 6-7), but Rule 8 does not impose a probability
 3 requirement and Plaintiffs' detailed allegations of real-time intercepts are plausible. *See Starr v. Baca*,
 4 652 F.3d 1202, 1216 (9th Cir. 2011) (a "complaint may be dismissed only when defendant's plausible
 5 alternative explanation is so convincing that plaintiff's explanation is *implausible*."') (emphasis in
 6 original); *see, e.g.*, *Campbell v. Facebook Inc.*, 77 F. Supp. 3d 836, 848 (N.D. Cal. 2014) ("Moreover,
 7 the complaint's allegation that users' messages were intercepted in transit is to be taken as true at this
 8 stage of the case."); *In re Yahoo Mail Litig.*, 7 F. Supp. 3d 1016, 1028 (N.D. Cal. 2014) ("[U]ntil the
 9 Court can determine when and how Yahoo intercepted users' emails, the Court must accept as true
 10 Plaintiffs' allegation that they were accessed while 'in transit.'"); *Byars v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.*,
 11 2023 WL 1788553, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 3, 2023) (upholding section 631 claim where defendant
 12 allegedly used a third-party service to intercept chats in real time).

13 Relying entirely on federal Wiretap Act cases, Defendants contend that the nature and speed of
 14 internet communications makes it impossible for Plaintiffs' communications to be intercepted while "in
 15 transit." Mot. at 6-7. But courts construe CIPA broadly, *Javier I*, 2022 WL 1744107, at *2, and have
 16 found it plausible that programs capturing keystrokes intercept communications "in flight" or upon their
 17 being sent or received. For instance, in *Luis v. Zang*, the Sixth Circuit held that allegations that a
 18 program called "WebWatcher immediately and instantaneously rout[e]s the intercepted communications
 19 to" the defendant's servers were sufficient to plead that the plaintiff's communications were intercepted
 20 contemporaneously for Wiretap Act purposes. 833 F.3d 619, 630 (6th Cir. 2016); *see also, e.g.*, *Byrd v.*
 21 *Aaron's, Inc.*, 2012 WL 12887775, at *7 (W.D. Pa. Feb. 17, 2012) (allegation that the plaintiff's
 22 keystrokes were captured and sent to a third-party server plausibly constituted "interception" under
 23 Wiretap Act); *Alhadeff v. Experian Info. Sols., Inc.*, 541 F. Supp. 3d 1041, 1044 (C.D. Cal. 2021)
 24 (plaintiff sufficiently alleged violation of Florida's "analog to the federal Wiretap Act" through
 25 defendant's use of similar "session replay" software to capture his mouse clicks and keystrokes);
 26 *Brahmana v. Lembo*, 2009 WL 1424438, at *3 (N.D. Cal. May 20, 2009) (Judge Whyte finding it
 27 plausible that use of key loggers to capture plaintiff's data violated Wiretap Act).

28

1 In *Luis*, the defendant's marketing supported the allegation the plaintiff's communications were
 2 captured "in flight" because, among other things, the advertising stated that the program at issue could
 3 record even if the document was never saved. 833 F.3d at 630-31. Here too, ActiveProspect's website
 4 and patent demonstrate TrustedForm intercepts Plaintiffs' information while it is "in flight." That
 5 website states that TrustedForm records a visitor's keystrokes, mouse clicks, and other website
 6 interactions in real time because it provides a "moment-by-moment replay" of what occurred on the
 7 page and in what order, down to the changes and corrections a user makes to the form. ¶ 25.
 8 ActiveProspect's website also admits that the "recording of keystrokes, mouse clicks, data entry, and
 9 other electronic communications begins the moment a user accesses or interacts with a webpage using
 10 TrustedForm." ¶ 29 (citing website). The allegation that TrustedForm captures user communications "in
 11 transit" are thus plausible; ActiveProspect records this information regardless of whether a user
 12 ultimately completes or submits the form. *E.g.*, ¶ 94 (TrustedForm intercepts communications by
 13 recording them when and as the user enters information, even before they click a button to submit the
 14 completed form to Prudential though its website). Therefore, instead of being "conclusory" (Mot. at 8),
 15 Plaintiffs' allegations that their communications were intercepted "in transit" are well founded. *In re*
 16 *Carrier IQ, Inc.*, 78 F. Supp. 3d 1051, 1078 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (allegations that communications were
 17 intercepted during the "transmission process" found sufficient).

18 Defendants' Wiretap Act cases are inapposite by virtue of the Ninth Circuit's holding that "in
 19 transit" means during transmission as contrasted with in storage. *Konop v. Hawaiian Airlines, Inc.*, 302
 20 F.3d 868, 878 & n.6 (9th Cir. 2002). Unlike the software here, which captures communications sent
 21 during transmission, "[t]he common thread in th[o]se cases is that the challenged acquisition occurred
 22 after the transmission was completed—the e-mail messages at issue were received by the destination
 23 server and no further 'movement' of the message was necessary." *In re Carrier IQ.*, 78 F. Supp. 3d at
 24 1078; *see also, e.g.*, *Adler v. Community.com, Inc.*, 2021 WL 4805435, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 2, 2021)
 25 ("Defendant's alleged access of that communication upon the completion of its transmission to the
 26 proper number is not the sort of act contemplated by federal law."); *In re Vizio, Inc., Consumer Privacy*
 27 *Litig.*, 238 F. Supp. 3d 1204, 1228 (C.D. Cal. 2017) (allegations indicated defendant transmitted
 28 information "significantly after the data arrive at the[] Smart TVs"); *NovelPoster v. Javitch Canfield*

1 *Grp.*, 140 F. Supp. 3d 938, 952 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (plaintiff only alleged that defendants prevented it from
 2 accessing accounts, and their “subsequent reading or forwarding” of emails once received did not occur
 3 during the transmission); *Garcia v. Haskett*, 2006 WL 1821232, at *4 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2006) (instead
 4 of suggesting her email was intercepted while in transit, plaintiff’s allegations showed “that the reverse
 5 is true: that the unread email was accessed while it was on the Partnership’s server, and that the server
 6 permanently stored all email.”). In this case, by contrast, TrustedForm “intercepts Class members’
 7 communications in transit while passing over the lines of internet communication by recording them in
 8 real time as the user enters information, even before the user clicks a button to submit the completed
 9 form” ¶ 94.

10 Defendants contest Plaintiffs’ allegations by pointing to ActiveProspect’s TrustedForm patent
 11 even though “district courts may not consider material outside the pleadings when assessing the
 12 sufficiency of a complaint under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.” *Khoja v.*
 13 *Orexigen Therapeutics, Inc.*, 899 F.3d 988, 998 (9th Cir. 2018). The Ninth Circuit cautioned that “[t]he
 14 overuse and improper application of judicial notice and the incorporation-by-reference doctrine . . . can
 15 lead to unintended and harmful results.” *Id.* In short, the Court may take judicial notice of the existence
 16 of the patent but not its claims or substance. *See Tripharma, LLC v. First Fruits Bus. Ministry LLC*,
 17 2023 WL 2695476, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 15, 2023) (taking judicial notice of patent documents “but not
 18 the truth of the matters asserted therein.”); *Baird v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.*, 522 F. Supp. 3d 679, 684
 19 (N.D. Cal. 2021) (declining to take judicial notice of documents where the “import of those
 20 documents is disputed”).

21 Defendants insist the patent “shows that the communications to the lead generator and the
 22 verification server occur at different times and via separate channels.” Mot. at 9. This is not a summary
 23 judgment motion, and the Court should not take judicial notice “to resolve disputed factual issues[.]”
 24 *Baron v. Hyrecar Inc.*, 2022 WL 17413562, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2022); *Khoja*, 899 F.3d at 1003
 25 (noting “prohibition against resolving factual disputes at the pleading stage.”); *see, e.g., Zeller v.*
 26 *Optavia, LLC*, 2022 WL 17858032, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2022) (declining to rely on website to
 27 disprove plaintiff’s claims). A court “may not judicially notice a fact that is subject to reasonable
 28 dispute” especially when it goes to “the heart of the dispute.” *Bushy v. Green*, 2022 WL 2442739, at *1

1 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2022); *Pollock v. Fed. Ins. Co.*, 2022 WL 912893, at *6 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2022)
 2 (“hotly disputed facts . . . are more appropriately resolved on summary judgment”); *Royal 4 Sys., Inc. v.*
 3 *RLI Ins. Co.*, 2022 WL 19263327, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 9, 2022) (rejecting request to consider contents
 4 of email to refute allegations).

5 It is not apparent either from Defendants’ explanation or by examining the diagram identified as
 6 “Figure 1” whether TrustedForm intercepts communications “in transit.” Mot. at 9; *see Eastman v.*
 7 *Apple, Inc.*, 2019 WL 3934805, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 20, 2019) (rejecting request to take judicial notice
 8 of patents to “do what *Khoja* forbids—ask the Court to take judicial notice of documents that they then
 9 use as a basis to challenge the factual averments in the complaint.”). As a result, the Court should
 10 decline the Defendants’ invitation to scrutinize the patent’s factual assertions or their Figure 1. *Cf. Five*
 11 *Star Gourmet Foods, Inc. v. Fresh Express, Inc.*, 2020 WL 1250802, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 16, 2020)
 12 (refusing to take judicial notice of photographs of product at issue in patent dispute because they had
 13 “several possible interpretations”).

14 Furthermore, even if the Court were to consider the patent, it corroborates Plaintiffs’ allegation
 15 that the data collection occurs in real time by stating that the “server collects information . . . during the
 16 communication session.” ¶ 30. Defendants, splitting hairs, assert that gathering a user’s information
 17 “during” the session is not necessarily the same thing as intercepting the information while it is in
 18 transit. Mot. at 7. Regardless, the patent also states that the software captures snapshots of the webpage
 19 *each time a change is detected*. ¶ 31. Considered together with ActiveProspect’s website representation
 20 that TrustedForm provides a “moment-by-moment replay” of events—including the sequence of
 21 changes to the form, whether or not it is submitted (¶ 25)—the patent further confirms the plausibility of
 22 Plaintiffs’ allegation of in-transit intercepts. *Starr*, 652 F.3d at 1216 (dismissal only justified if a
 23 defendant’s contrary explanation renders the plaintiff’s explanation implausible); *see also Produce Pay,*
 24 *Inc. v. Izguerra Produce, Inc.*, 39 F.4th 1158, 1166 (9th Cir. 2022) (even if some portions of attached
 25 exhibits supported a competing interpretation, dismissal was unwarranted because the documents did not
 26 “uniformly or directly contradict” the plaintiff’s allegations).

27 **2. ActiveProspect Is an Unauthorized Third Party.**

28 Section 631 prohibits accessing communications without the consent of all parties. *Matera v.*

1 *Google Inc.*, 2016 WL 5339806, at *16 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2016) (“To establish a consent defense
 2 under CIPA, both parties—the sender and the recipient of the communication—must consent”).
 3 Defendants claim that section 631 only prohibits eavesdropping by third parties and that because
 4 ActiveProspect acted entirely as an extension of Prudential, it cannot be considered a third-party
 5 eavesdropper under CIPA. Mot. at 9. Defendants acknowledge the Court considered and rejected this
 6 argument in *Javier*, 2023 WL 114225, at *3-6, but “include the argument here to preserve it, and also to
 7 explain . . . the bases upon which the Court held ActiveProspect was not a third party.” Mot. at 10.
 8 Defendants’ repackaging of their unsuccessful argument offers no cogent reason to depart from *Javier*.

9 The Court noted section 631 “creates four avenues for relief” and the second prong makes a
 10 defendant liable when it “willfully and without consent of all parties to the communication, or in any
 11 unauthorized manner, reads, or attempts to read, or to learn the contents or meaning of any message,
 12 report, or communication while the same is in transit” whereas the third prong applies when a defendant
 13 “uses, or attempts to use, in any manner, or for any purpose, or to communicate in any way, any
 14 information so obtained[.]” *Javier v. Assurance IQ, LLC* (“*Javier II*”), No. 20-CV-02860-CRB, — F.
 15 Supp. 3d —, 2023 WL 114225, at *6 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2023). The Court further observed that other
 16 courts have taken two different approaches with respect to section 631 and software providers like
 17 ActiveProspect. Some courts have held that such companies can be considered unauthorized third
 18 parties, 2023 WL 114225, at *5 (citing, *inter alia*, *Revitch*, 2019 WL 5485330, at *1), while other courts
 19 have treated software providers as mere extensions of the companies that engage them. *See, e.g.*,
 20 *Williams v. What If Holdings, LLC*, 2022 WL 17869275, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2022). This Court
 21 declined to adopt the reasoning in the latter cases because interpreting the second prong of section
 22 631(a) “based on the intentions and usage of the prospective third party . . . would add requirements that
 23 are not present (and swallow the third prong in the process).” *Javier II*, 2023 WL 114225, at *6.

24 Although Defendants disagree, they cite no additional authority for their interpretation that the
 25 second prong of section 631 turns on whether the third party “intended to use the collected data for its
 26 own purposes.” Mot. at 10. Nor do they explain why reading an intent requirement into the second prong
 27 would not impose a new requirement that is absent from the statutory text. 2023 WL 114225, at *6.
 28 Defendants suggest their reading would give effect to both the second and third prongs (Mot. at 10

1 (citing *Williams*, 2022 WL 17869275, at *2)), but the Court already considered *Williams* and declined to
 2 adopt that interpretation.² Defendants' reading of the second prong of section 631, as permitting web
 3 businesses to hire third parties to secretly record their customers' communications, is not only extra-
 4 textual but contradicts the mandate of interpreting the statute "in light of [its] broad privacy-protecting"
 5 objective. *Javier I*, 2022 WL 1744107, at *2; *cf. Saleh*, 562 F. Supp. 3d at 520 (rejecting interpretation
 6 "that would vitiate the statute's protections.").

7 In *Javier II*, the Court also rejected two additional arguments for why ActiveProspect should not
 8 be considered a third-party eavesdropper: (1) because ActiveProspect does not have the capability of
 9 using its recording of the website interaction for any other purpose and (2) because "the ubiquity of
 10 services like ActiveProspect on the internet effectively renders it party to the 'firsthand dissemination'
 11 of [plaintiff's] information to [the website owner]." 2023 WL 114225, at *6. As to the first argument,
 12 Defendants contend that Plaintiffs do not allege facts suggesting ActiveProspect had the right or
 13 capability to use TrustedForm for an independent purpose. Yet Defendants concede that Plaintiffs do
 14 allege that ActiveProspect's EULA allows it to use data for other purposes. Mot. at 11; ¶ 35. While
 15 Defendants claim that Plaintiffs do not allege that the EULA applies to its relationship with Prudential or
 16 permits ActiveProspect to use Plaintiffs' individual information, the Court cited similar allegations when
 17 rejecting a substantially identical argument. *See Javier II*, 2023 WL 114225, at *6 (noting that the
 18 plaintiff did allege that ActiveProspect can use the information it collects "for other purposes, even if
 19 [he] has not alleged that they have done so in this case").³

20 Thus, Defendants provide no basis for the Court to revisit its ruling on the third-party issue.

21

22 ² Defendants also maintain that TrustedForm is like the tape recorder in *Rogers v. Ulrich*, 52 Cal. App.
 23 3d 894 (1975), but the Court considered and rejected this same analogy in *Javier II*, consistent with case
 24 law. *See, e.g., Yoon v. Lululemon USA, Inc.*, 549 F. Supp. 3d 1073, 1081 (C.D. Cal. 2021) ("Yoon's first
 25 claim for relief survives Quantum Metric's participant exception challenge because she alleges that QM
 26 captures, stores, and interprets her real-time data—which extends beyond the ordinary function of a tape
 recorder."); *Saleh*, 562 F. Supp. 3d at 520 ("Unlike the recorders in *Rogers* . . . FullStory is a separate
 legal entity that offers 'software-as-a-service' and not merely a passive device.").

27 ³ Defendants do not dispute that the second additional argument fails because, as in *Javier II*, Plaintiffs
 28 were "unaware . . . that [their] keystrokes, mouse clicks, and other electronic communications . . . would
 be disclosed to ActiveProspect[.]" 2023 WL 114225, at *6; ¶¶ 60, 64, 68, 72.

1 **B. Plaintiffs Adequately Allege Invasion of Privacy.**

2 An invasion of privacy claim under the California Constitution requires Plaintiffs to show (1)
 3 they have a legally protected privacy interest, (2) they maintain a reasonable expectation of privacy, and
 4 (3) the invasive act is highly offensive and an egregious breach of social norms. *In re Facebook, Inc.*
 5 *Internet Tracking Litig.*, 956 F.3d 589, 601 (9th Cir. 2020). Defendants do not dispute that first two
 6 elements are met but assert that intercepting the sensitive health information of people who visit
 7 Prudential’s website is not egregious. Mot. at 12. But that is a question for the fact finder. As such,
 8 “determinations of the egregiousness of the privacy intrusion are not usually resolved at the pleading
 9 stage.” *Katz-Lacabe v. Oracle America, Inc.*, 2023 WL 2838118, at *7 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2023);
 10 *Calhoun v. Google LLC*, 526 F. Supp. 3d 605, 631 (N.D. Cal. 2021).

11 In Defendants’ self-serving conception, collecting “information about Plaintiffs’ devices, their
 12 geolocation, and the amount of time they spent on Prudential’s website” is routine commercial conduct
 13 and therefore inoffensive. “But that is not the kind of information at issue here.” *In re Meta Pixel*
 14 *Healthcare Litig.*, 2022 WL 17869218, at *16 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2022). Defendants not only intercept
 15 and collect device settings, physical location, and the duration of sessions without prior consent; they
 16 also intercept and collect the answers to questions about people’s medical and psychological issues, the
 17 medications they take, and whether they have been hospitalized. ¶¶ 4, 39, 43(j) (quoting website prompt:
 18 “have you been treated or prescribed medication for . . . anxiety/depression/bipolar; cancer; chronic
 19 pain; diabetes; heart or circulatory disorder; respiratory disorder”). The private health information
 20 Defendants acquire is different in kind from the commercial information that courts in other cases have
 21 held insufficiently sensitive to form the basis for an invasion of privacy. In *Katz-Lacabe*, the court
 22 concluded that the defendant’s alleged collection of “sensitive health” and other personal information
 23 went “well beyond” routine commercial behavior and was sufficiently egregious to allow an invasion of
 24 privacy claim to proceed. 2023 WL 2838118, at *7; *see also In re Google RTB Consumer Privacy Litig.*,
 25 606 F. Supp. 3d 935, 947 (N.D. Cal. 2022) (denying motion to dismiss constitutional privacy claim
 26 involving disclosure of health and other personal information); *Cline v. Reetz-Laiolo*, 329 F. Supp. 3d
 27 1000, 1051 (N.D. Cal. 2018) (intrusion upon emails containing private information including “medical
 28 conditions and needs” supported privacy claim under California Constitution). The extensive federal and

1 state statutory schemes protecting private health details confirm that their unauthorized disclosure
 2 breaches societal norms: “By enacting criminal and civil statutes forbidding the disclosure of protected
 3 health information without proper authorization, Congress has made policy decisions regarding the
 4 importance of safekeeping this information.” *In re Meta*, 2022 WL 17869218, at *16.

5 Defendants argue that Plaintiffs’ medical information was relevant to a life insurance quote and
 6 was collected and preserved only for verification purposes, despite Plaintiffs’ allegations that it was used
 7 for monetary gain. Mot. at 12-13. Whether there is a legitimate use for intercepted data does not resolve
 8 the question of whether the intrusion is highly offensive. *See Brown v. Google LLC*, 525 F. Supp. 3d
 9 1049, 1079-80 (N.D. Cal. 2021) (rejecting argument that interceptions were not highly offensive
 10 because they “served a legitimate commercial purpose” given that the analysis involves a “holistic
 11 consideration of a multitude of factors”) (citing *In re Facebook*, 956 F.3d at 606 (these factors include
 12 “the likelihood of serious harm to the victim, the degree and setting of the intrusion, the intruder’s
 13 motives and objectives, and whether countervailing interests or social norms render the intrusion
 14 inoffensive”)).

15 While Defendants deny that their conduct is highly offensive, they do “not point to a single case
 16 where a court found that the collection of the kinds of information at issue here did not constitute a
 17 highly offensive invasion of privacy.” *In re Meta*, 2022 WL 17869218, at *16. They cite this Court’s
 18 decision in *Hammerling v. Google LLC*, but, in contrast to the sensitive medical facts intercepted in this
 19 case, the plaintiff in *Hammerling* alleged Google collected information about “searches of a foot
 20 massager, slippers, meal subscriptions, coconut oil” and other consumer products. 2022 WL 17365255,
 21 at *9 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 1, 2022). Defendants also rely on *Folgelstrom v. Lamps Plus, Inc.*, 195 Cal. App.
 22 4th 986, 991 (2011), but the conduct at issue there, too, was “routine commercial behavior” because the
 23 defendant merely obtained the plaintiff’s address without his permission “to mail him coupons and other
 24 advertisements.” In Defendants’ remaining cases, the plaintiffs did not allege that the defendant tracked
 25 or disclosed “any type of sensitive financial information, medical information, or passwords.” *Yunker v.*
 26 *Pandora Media, Inc.*, 2013 WL 1282980, at *15 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2013); *see also, e.g., In re iPhone*
 27 *Application Litig.*, 844 F. Supp. 2d 1040, 1063 (N.D. Cal. 2012) (“information allegedly disclosed to
 28 third parties included the unique device identifier number, personal data, and geolocation information”);

1 *In re Google, Inc. Privacy Policy Litig.*, 58 F. Supp. 3d 968, 987 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (similar). Thus,
 2 because Plaintiffs allege the unauthorized disclosure of sensitive medical and other highly confidential
 3 facts, their invasion of privacy claim is viable. *See In re Facebook*, 956 F.3d at 606 (“The ultimate
 4 question of whether Facebook’s tracking and collection practices could highly offend a reasonable
 5 individual is an issue that cannot be resolved at the pleading stage.”).

6 **C. Plaintiffs’ UCL Claims Should Be Sustained.**

7 Defendants also contest Plaintiffs’ UCL claim. Defendants first contend that Plaintiffs lack
 8 statutory standing on the grounds they did not lose money or property as a result of the alleged
 9 misconduct. Mot. at 13-14. But Plaintiffs allege that Defendants’ interception and use of their personal
 10 information diminished its value (¶ 108), which is a recognized form of economic injury under the UCL.
 11 *Overstock.com v. Gradient Analytics, Inc.*, 151 Cal. App. 4th 688, 716 (2007). Plaintiffs cite several
 12 studies that show that the information Defendants intercepted has value. ¶¶ 55-56; *cf. In re Facebook*,
 13 956 F.3d at 600 (“Because California law recognizes a legal interest in unjustly earned profits, Plaintiffs
 14 have adequately pleaded an entitlement to Facebook’s profits from users’ personal data sufficient to
 15 confer Article III standing. Plaintiffs allege that their browsing histories carry financial value. They
 16 point to the existence of a study that values users’ browsing histories at \$52 per year”). In fact,
 17 Defendants themselves concede (and exploit) the value of users’ personal information. Prudential states
 18 on its website that it sells such information for advertising. ¶ 55. It also sells “leads” based on
 19 information intercepted by ActiveProspect and relies on TrustedForm because it is designed to increase
 20 the value of leads generated through user information. ¶¶ 37, 55, 108. Defendants’ unauthorized
 21 interception and use of Plaintiffs’ valuable data therefore confers standing under the UCL. *See Calhoun*,
 22 526 F. Supp. 3d at 636 (“[T]he Ninth Circuit and a number of district courts, including this Court, have
 23 concluded that plaintiffs who suffered a loss of their personal information suffered economic injury and
 24 had standing.”); *accord In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, 2016 WL 3029783, at *15 (N.D. Cal.
 25 May 27, 2016).

26 Further, because Plaintiffs have adequately alleged a CIPA violation, they state a UCL claim for
 27 unlawful conduct. *See Bruton v. Gerber Prod. Co.*, 703 F. App’x 468, 472 (9th Cir. 2017). Defendants’
 28 only challenge to Plaintiffs’ “unfair” claim is that it rests entirely on the unlawful prong. Mot. at 14-15.

1 But CIPA, among other enactments, embodies the legislatively declared policy against the unauthorized
 2 interception of private communications. Plaintiffs' claims accordingly meet the "tethering" test used in
 3 determining whether a business practice is "unfair." *See In re Adobe Sys., Inc. Privacy Litig.*, 66 F.
 4 Supp. 3d 1197, 1226 (N.D. Cal. 2014); *Pallen v. Twin Hill Acquisition Co.*, 2013 WL 12130033, at *4
 5 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2013). Defendants do not address the alternative "balancing" test often used in
 6 consumer cases, which is "'fact intensive and is not conducive to resolution' at the motion to dismiss
 7 phase." *Gianino v. Alacer Corp.*, 2010 WL 11468710, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 4, 2010) (citation omitted);
 8 *see McKell v. Wash. Mut., Inc.*, 142 Cal. App. 4th 1457, 1473 (2006). Defendants' interception of
 9 Plaintiffs' private facts without their knowledge or consent satisfies the UCL's consumer balancing test.
 10 *See Calhoun*, 526 F. Supp. 3d at 636; *In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, 162 F. Supp. 3d 953, 990
 11 (N.D. Cal. 2016).

12 **IV. CONCLUSION**

13 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants' motion should be denied. If the Court grants the motion
 14 in whole or part, Plaintiffs respectfully request leave to amend under Rule 15.

15 Dated: May 3, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

17 /s/ Adam E. Polk
 18 Adam E. Polk (SBN 273000)
 19 Simon Grille (SBN 294914)
 20 Nina R. Gliozzo (SBN 333569)
GIRARD SHARP LLP
 21 601 California Street, Suite 1400
 22 San Francisco, CA 94108
 23 Telephone: (415) 981-4800
 24 Facsimile: (415) 981-4846
 25 apolk@girardsharp.com
 26 sgrille@girardsharp.com
 27 ngliozzo@girardsharp.com

28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 10010
 10011
 10012
 10013
 10014
 10015
 10016
 10017
 10018
 10019
 10020
 10021
 10022
 10023
 10024
 10025
 10026
 10027
 10028
 10029
 10030
 10031
 10032
 10033
 10034
 10035
 10036
 10037
 10038
 10039
 10040
 10041
 10042
 10043
 10044
 10045
 10046
 10047
 10048
 10049
 10050
 10051
 10052
 10053
 10054
 10055
 10056
 10057
 10058
 10059
 10060
 10061
 10062
 10063
 10064
 10065
 10066
 10067
 10068
 10069
 10070
 10071
 10072
 10073
 10074
 10075
 10076
 10077
 10078
 10079
 10080
 10081
 10082
 10083
 10084
 10085
 10086
 10087
 10088
 10089
 10090
 10091
 10092
 10093
 10094
 10095
 10096
 10097
 10098
 10099
 100100
 100101
 100102
 100103
 100104
 100105
 100106
 100107
 100108
 100109
 100110
 100111
 100112
 100113
 100114
 100115
 100116
 100117
 100118
 100119
 100120
 100121
 100122
 100123
 100124
 100125
 100126
 100127
 100128
 100129
 100130
 100131
 100132
 100133
 100134
 100135
 100136
 100137
 100138
 100139
 100140
 100141
 100142
 100143
 100144
 100145
 100146
 100147
 100148
 100149
 100150
 100151
 100152
 100153
 100154
 100155
 100156
 100157
 100158
 100159
 100160
 100161
 100162
 100163
 100164
 100165
 100166
 100167
 100168
 100169
 100170
 100171
 100172
 100173
 100174
 100175
 100176
 100177
 100178
 100179
 100180
 100181
 100182
 100183
 100184
 100185
 100186
 100187
 100188
 100189
 100190
 100191
 100192
 100193
 100194
 100195
 100196
 100197
 100198
 100199
 100200
 100201
 100202
 100203
 100204
 100205
 100206
 100207
 100208
 100209
 100210
 100211
 100212
 100213
 100214
 100215
 100216
 100217
 100218
 100219
 100220
 100221
 100222
 100223
 100224
 100225
 100226
 100227
 100228
 100229
 100230
 100231
 100232
 100233
 100234
 100235
 100236
 100237
 100238
 100239
 100240
 100241
 100242
 100243
 100244
 100245
 100246
 100247
 100248
 100249
 100250
 100251
 100252
 100253
 100254
 100255
 100256
 100257
 100258
 100259
 100260
 100261
 100262
 100263
 100264
 100265
 100266
 100267
 100268
 100269
 100270
 100271
 100272
 100273
 100274
 100275
 100276
 100277
 100278
 100279
 100280
 100281
 100282
 100283
 100284
 100285
 100286
 100287
 100288
 100289
 100290
 100291
 100292
 100293
 100294
 100295
 100296
 100297
 100298
 100299
 100300
 100301
 100302
 100303
 100304
 100305
 100306
 100307
 100308
 100309
 100310
 100311
 100312
 100313
 100314
 100315
 100316
 100317
 100318
 100319
 100320
 100321
 100322
 100323
 100324
 100325
 100326
 100327
 100328
 100329
 100330
 100331
 100332
 100333
 100334
 100335
 100336
 100337
 100338
 100339
 100340
 100341
 100342
 100343
 100344
 100345
 100346
 100347
 100348
 100349
 100350
 100351
 100352
 100353
 100354
 100355
 100356
 100357
 100358
 100359
 100360
 100361
 100362
 100363
 100364
 100365
 100366
 100367
 100368
 100369
 100370
 100371
 100372
 100373
 10